arXiv:quant-ph/9502002v1 2 Feb 1995

February 1, 2008

Cannot Local Reality Exist in the EPR-Bohm Gedankenexperiment ?

Satoshi Uchiyama

Department of Physics, Faculty of Science,
Hokkaido University, Sapporo 060, Japan

(e-mail: uchiyama@particle.phys.hokudai.ac.jp)

ABSTRACT

We model measuring processes of a single spin-1/2 object and of a pair of spin-1/2 objects in the EPR-Bohm state by systems of differential equations. Our model is a local model with hidden-variables of the EPR-Bohm Gedankenexperiment. Although there is no dynamical interaction between a pair of spin-1/2 objects, the model can reproduce approximately the quantum-mechanical correlations by the coincidence counting. Hence the Bell inequality is violated. This result supports the idea that the coincidence counting is the source of the non-locality in the EPR-Bohm Gedankenexperiment.

1. Introduction

It is known that quantum mechanics can not be reduced to any non-contextual hidden-variable theories[1]. This means that the probability space of outcomes of measurements changes according to what is measured. A hidden-variable theory with such many probability spaces is often called a *contextual* hidden-variable theory[2]. In such a theory, we usually consider that the change of the probability space is due to the interaction between the object and the measuring apparatus. Bell argues that in the EPR-Bohm Gedankenexperiment, this interpretation leads us to an unacceptable conclusion. He insists that if the Bell inequality is not satisfied, then there exists action at a distance in the EPR-Bohm Gedankenexperiment[3]. Several EPR-Bohm type experiments have already been performed since then and violations of the Bell type inequalities have been observed[4]. As a result, it has been widely believed that quantum mechanics has a non-local character such as action at a distance. It is hardly known, however, that several authors[5−9] showed that violation of the Bell inequality did not always mean existence of the action at a distance, making local models that violate the Bell type inequalities, about ten years ago. Especially, Scarela[7], Notarigo[8] and Pascazio[9] argue that the coincidence counting is a source of the non-locality. They make only models for photons, since most of the experiments were performed for pairs of photons.

In this paper, we shall present a local model for spin-1/2 objects, in accordance with the Bohm version[10] of the EPR Gedankenexperiment, which violates the Bell inequality as a result of the coincidence counting. Quantum mechanics describes statistical results of measurements economically, but it does not explain how the results occur. To see clearly whether there exists action at a distance or not, we have to refer to states of the objects before and after measurements, i.e., processes of measurements. Hence our model comprises hidden-variables. The purpose of this paper is neither to explain why the values of spin are quantized nor to replace quantum mechanics by classical mechanics. The aim of this paper is to

find an example, at least in thinking, that shows that the coincidence counting is the source of the non-locality. In our model, in order to describe the time evolution of a measuring process, we use a system of differential equations which has attractors. Since the attractors are invariant for the flow, they are invariant for the measurement. So the attractors are related to corresponding quantum-mechanical eigenstates. This is a new feature of our model.

The organization of this paper is as follows: In §2, we shall construct a model of a measurement for a single spin-1/2 object. This section contains also preparation of the next section. In §3, we shall make an extension of the model of §2 to the EPR-Bohm situation. This section is the heart of this paper. By taking an appropriate closing time in sampling data, our model reproduces the correlations predicted by quantum mechanics approximately. Section 4 is devoted to discussion and summary.

2. A hidden-variable model of a measurement of a single spin-1/2 object

In this section, we shall exhibit a model of measuring processes of a spin-1/2 object. A measuring apparatus changes a state of the object due to interaction between them, hence this change is not instantaneous generally. Therefore a system of ordinary differential equations is used in order to describe this change. For a different setting of the measuring apparatus, time evolution of a state of the object is governed by a different system of differential equations. For different settings of the measuring apparatus, the probability spaces of outcomes are different . Thus our model becomes a contextual hidden-variable theory.

A spin-1/2 object is not a mere point particle but a system of many degrees of freedom, because the spin can be considered as degrees of freedom that describe a rotation of the object on some axis. We denote these degrees of freedom by $\mathbf{S} = (S_x, S_y, S_z) \in \mathbf{R}^3$. Quantum mechanics gives us the following information about the spin: For convenience, using the unit such that $\hbar$=1, we put $j = 1/2$,

$J = \sqrt{3/4}$ and denote the quantum-mechanical observables of the spin by three-tuple of operators $(\hat{S}_x, \hat{S}_y, \hat{S}_z)$; The up(down)-eigenstate of $\hat{S}_z$ has the eigenvalue $+j(-j)$ for $\hat{S}_z$ and J^2 for $\hat{S}_x{}^2 + \hat{S}_y{}^2 + \hat{S}_z{}^2$, respectively. Hence the up-eigenstate of $\hat{S}_z$ may correspond to an ensemble whose members have the properties of $S_z = +j$ and $|\mathbf{S}| = J$. $\mathbf{S}$ is yet insufficient to describe a state of the spin-1/2 object, since $\mathbf{S}$ itself that satisfies above properties is not parallel to the z-axis. We must take account of other degrees of freedom that express that a state is a member of an ensemble corresponding to the up-eigenstate. We denote them by $\mathbf{U} = (U_x, U_y, U_z)$. In actual experiments, it does not matter when the object enters the measuring apparatus and when it escapes from it. Hence we do not have to take account of details of the motion of the object in the actual space. However they become important for coincidence counting. And we shall take them into account in the next section. We shall see in this section that the six degrees of freedom are sufficient to model the measuring process of a single spin-1/2 object.

We denote a six dimensional space $\mathbf{R}^6$ whose coordinates are given by the $(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{U}) = (S_x, S_y, S_z, U_x, U_y, U_z)$ by Γ. A state of the object is represented by a point $(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{U})$ in Γ.

Let α_1 be a subset of Γ that is defined as

$$\alpha_1 = \{(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{U}) \in \Gamma : S_z = +j, |\mathbf{S}|^2 = J^2, U_x = U_y = U_z - J = 0\}.$$

As stated above, we identify an ensemble of states distributed uniformly in α_1 with the up-eigenstate of $\hat{S}_z$. In the same way, let α_2 be a subset of Γ that is defined as

$$\alpha_2 = \{(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{U}) \in \Gamma : S_z = -j, |\mathbf{S}|^2 = J^2, U_x = U_y = U_z + J = 0\}$$

and we identify an ensemble of states distributed uniformly in α_2 with the down-eigenstate of $\hat{S}_z$.

A good measuring apparatus for z-component of the spin must effect such a change of a state of the object that the state approaches to either α_1 or α_2.

Therefore the measuring process of z-component of the spin may be modeled by a system of differential equations for which α_1 and α_2 are attractors[11]. The simplest one among such systems of differential equations may be the following:

$$\begin{cases} \dfrac{d\mathbf{S}}{dt} = \mathbf{U}\times\mathbf{S} - \epsilon_1 P_{xy}\dfrac{\partial\psi}{\partial\mathbf{S}}\psi - \epsilon_1\big\{\theta(S_z-\beta)\phi_+ + \theta(-S_z+\beta)\phi_-\big\}\mathbf{e}_z, \\ \dfrac{d\mathbf{U}}{dt} = -\epsilon_2 P_{xy}\mathbf{U} - \epsilon_2\big\{U_z - \epsilon(S_z-\beta)J\big\}\mathbf{e}_z - \epsilon_2 U_z\big\{|\mathbf{U}|^2 - J^2\big\}\mathbf{e}_z, \end{cases} \tag{2.1}$$

where $\epsilon_1 = 10.0$, $\epsilon_2 = 0.05$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(\mathbf{S}) \equiv& |\mathbf{S}|^2 - J^2, \\ \phi_\pm(\mathbf{S}) \equiv& S_z \mp j, \\ \omega(\mathbf{U}) \equiv& \cos^{-1}(U_z/|\mathbf{U}|), \\ \beta(\omega) \equiv& \big\{j\cos\omega - \sqrt{J^2-j^2}\cos(\frac{\pi}{2}(1-\cos\omega))\sin\omega\big\} \\ & \times\big\{0.98\theta(|\cos\omega|-0.99) + \theta(0.99-|\cos\omega|)\big\}, \\ \mathbf{e}_z =& \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, \qquad P_{xy} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

$\theta(x)$ is the step function that is defined as $\theta(x) = 1$, if $x \geq 0$; $\theta(x) = 0$, otherwise. And $\epsilon(x)$ is the sign function that is defined as $\epsilon(x) = 1$, if $x \geq 0$; $\epsilon(x) = -1$, otherwise. For simplicity, the unit of time is chosen appropriately. Thus we assume that the evolution of a state $(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{U})$ during *the measurement of* S_z, i.e., z-component of the spin, is governed by (2.1).

We wish to make some remarks on Eq.(2.1). The terms containing ϵ_i's, $i = 1, 2$, of Eq.(2.1) are crucial for the existence of the attractors α_1 and α_2. To see this, suppose that there is no terms in the right-hand sides of Eq.(2.1) except for $-\epsilon_1 P_{xy}(\partial\psi/\partial\mathbf{S})\psi$. Then $(d\psi^2/dt)$=$2(\partial\psi/\partial\mathbf{S})\cdot(d\mathbf{S}/dt)\psi$=$-8\epsilon_1(S_x^2+S_y^2)\psi^2 \leq 0$. If neither $S_x^2 + S_y^2$ nor ψ vanish, then $\psi(\mathbf{S}(t))^2$ is strictly monotone decreasing as a function of time t. As $t \to \infty$, ψ^2 may vanish, i.e., $|\mathbf{S}|^2$ may approach to J^2. It is similar for the other terms containing ϵ_1 or ϵ_2. The role of the function $\beta(\omega)$ is to

give a border of $S_z \to +j$ or $S_z \to -j$. Thus the terms containing ϵ_i's, $i = 1, 2$, represent effectively the influence on a state of the object of the interaction with the measuring apparatus.

In actual experiments, we use, for example, the Stern-Gerlach magnet as a measuring apparatus of S_z. In this case, the z-component of spin is not directly measured. We judge $S_z = +j$ or $-j$ according to the sign of z-component of the velocity of the object gained eventually by the non-uniform magnetic field. Since $\mathbf{S}$ may behave as if a magnetic dipole, if $\mathbf{S}$ is stabilized in a neighborhood of $\alpha_1(\alpha_2)$, then $S_z > 0(< 0)$, so the object gains positive(negative) z-component of velocity. From these considerations, let us regard the measurement of S_z in our model as the following procedure: A state $(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{U})$ of the object begins to evolve by the equation (2.1), when the interaction between the object and the measuring apparatus is switched on. When the state in Γ comes into an appropriate neighborhood $G(\alpha_1) \equiv \{(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{U}) \in \Gamma : |S_z - j| < \delta\}$ of α_1, $\delta = 0.01$, the measurement finishes and we obtain the outcome $+j$. Otherwise, when the state in Γ comes into an appropriate neighborhood $G(\alpha_2) \equiv \{(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{U}) \in \Gamma : |S_z + j| < \delta\}$ of α_2, the measurement finishes and we obtain the outcome $-j$.

Rigorously speaking, the measured z-component of the spin is not represented by S_z; rather it is represented by a slightly modified function $\tilde{S}_z$ defined on Γ as

$$\tilde{S}_z(\rho) = \begin{cases} +j, & \text{if } \rho \in G(\alpha_1), \\ -j, & \text{if } \rho \in G(\alpha_2), \\ S_z(\rho), & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

For brevity, we shall write that $S_z \Rightarrow j$ in place of $\tilde{S}_z = j$ and so on hereafter. We have finished the presentation of the model of a measuring process of S_z here.

Let T_θ be a rotation (matrix) by an angle θ along an axis in x-y plane in $\mathbf{R}^3$. When we perform a measurement of $\mathbf{S} \cdot T_\theta \mathbf{e}_z$, the evolution of a state is given by a system of differential equations that is obtained by rotating Eq.(2.1). Let β_θ be a subset of Γ defined as $\beta_\theta \equiv \{(T_\theta \mathbf{S}, T_\theta \mathbf{U}) \in \Gamma : (\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{U}) \in \alpha_1\}$, i.e., it is

obtained by rotating α_1. Then the β_θ is an attractor associated with the property of $\mathbf{S} \cdot T_\theta \mathbf{e}_z \Rightarrow j$.

As an initial condition, we study an ensemble of states distributed uniformly in the β_θ. When we perform the measurements of $\mathbf{S} \cdot T_\theta \mathbf{e}_z$ for this ensemble, $\mathbf{S} \cdot T_\theta \mathbf{e}_z \Rightarrow j$ holds with certainty, since all the members of the ensemble are already in the neighborhood $G(\beta_\theta)$ of the attractor β_θ. Hence such an ensemble can be identified with an eigenstate of the quantum-mechanical observable corresponding to $\mathbf{S} \cdot T_\theta \mathbf{e}_z$. Taking this ensemble as the initial condition and solving Eq.(2.1) numerically, we have calculated the probabilities that the trajectories come into the neighborhoods $G(\alpha_1)$ of α_1 and $G(\alpha_2)$ of α_2, respectively. We show in Fig. 1 the probabilities of outcomes of the measurements of $S_z = \mathbf{S} \cdot \mathbf{e}_z$ being $+j$ with respect to the ensembles of states distributed uniformly in β_θ for several relative angles θ. The result fits with the prediction of quantum mechanics. In this sense, we can say that the model of this section is the one of measuring processes of a single spin-1/2 object.

Before closing this section, we wish to make a remark. We call the time when the interaction between the object and the measuring apparatus is switched on a *beginning time*. And we call the time when the state comes into one of the neighborhoods of the two attractors a *finishing time*. Since we may put the beginning time for each states to be zero without loss of generality, we do so hereafter. The finishing time for each objects depends both on what is measured and on the initial states. In general, finishing times fluctuate due to the variation of initial states, even if the beginning times are the same. This fluctuation plays an important role when we use the coincidence counting as in the next section.

3. A local model of the EPR-Bohm Gedankenexperiment

Now we shall make an extension of the previous model to the EPR-Bohm Gedankenexperiment. We consider two spin-1/2 objects which are distinguished by labeling with A and B. Let Γ_A and Γ_B be the phase spaces of the spin-1/2 objects A and B, respectively. The whole phase space Γ_{AB} is given by the direct product $\Gamma_A \times \Gamma_B$. Suppose that two measuring apparatuses are placed apart on the y-axis at equidistance from the origin. For convenience, we shall measure components of the spins along directions perpendicular to the y-axis.

The EPR-Bohm quantum-mechanical state is a singlet state. We note that it is rotationally invariant; and in the quantum-mechanical state, the pair of spins has completely negative correlations. Let s be a subset of Γ_{AB} defined as

$$s \equiv \bigcup_{\phi=0}^{2\pi} \bigcup_{\theta=0}^{\pi} \Big\{ (\mathbf{S}_A, \mathbf{U}_A, \mathbf{S}_B, \mathbf{U}_B) \in \Gamma_{AB} : \mathbf{S}_A + \mathbf{S}_B = \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{U}_A + \mathbf{U}_B = \mathbf{0}, \\ \big(R_y(-\theta) R_z(-\phi) \mathbf{S}_A, R_y(-\theta) R_z(-\phi) \mathbf{U}_A \big) \in \alpha_1 \Big\},$$

where $R_z(\phi)$ and $R_y(\theta)$ represent the rotation along the z-axis by an angle ϕ and the rotation along the y-axis by an angle θ, respectively. An ensemble of states of pairs distributed uniformly in the subset s has the above mentioned two features of the EPR-Bohm quantum-mechanical state. Hence let us take this ensemble as an initial condition just before measurements in the EPR-Bohm situation.

In the actual experiment, the coincidence counting is used in order to identify detected objects as a pair. Therefore the time when the object escapes from the measuring apparatus is important. Since the actual motion of the object in the measuring apparatus may be complicated, in stead of modeling the details of the motion concretely, we just assume that there exists a threshold time T such that if the finishing time is greater than T, then as a result of the interaction with the measuring apparatus, the value of y-coordinate of the object becomes random. We can also rephrase this assumption as follows: There is T such that if the finishing

time is greater than T, then the time when the object escapes from the measuring apparatus fluctuates. We emphasize that this assumption concerns itself with only each of measuring apparatuses and the objects, so no action at a distance is stolen into our model by this assumption. It shall be shown later that by the coincidence counting, a pair of spin-1/2 objects is taken into account as outcomes of measurements, only if their finishing times are less then T. Hence we call T a *closing time* in sampling data.

We calculated correlations of the spins of the objects A and B with a closing time $T = 0.133$ numerically as in the previous section. The results are plotted in Fig. 2 and compared with the quantum-mechanical correlations. Our model approximates the quantum-mechanical correlations. For comparison, we also calculated the correlations without the closing time, i.e., without using the coincidence counting. The results are plotted in Fig. 3. In this case, since we instituted no closing time, the correlations were calculated in a single probability space independent of what are measured. Since our model has no action at a distance, as expected from the no-go-theorems[(1)] of non-contextual hidden-variable theories, the result does not agree with quantum mechanics without the closing time.

Figure 4 represents the results of calculations of the quantity $F(\phi)$ that appears in Ref. (12). The Bell inequality implies that $F(\phi)$ does not exceed two. The results with the closing time $T = 0.133$ agree with quantum mechanics approximately and the Bell inequality is violated. The results without the closing time, on the other hand, satisfy the Bell inequality and do not agree with quantum mechanics.

Our task is now to express the assumption for the motion of the position of the object more concretely and show that the coincidence counting leads to the institution of a closing time in sampling data. Suppose that the devices of the Gedankenexperiment are arranged as follows (see Fig. 5): The source of pairs of the objects is at the origin. Measuring apparatuses for the object A and the object B are placed apart on the y-axis at equidistance from the origin. Let W be their lengths along the y-direction. A detector for the object A is placed behind the

measuring apparatus, say on $(0, -L, 0)$, viz., on the y-axis at the distance L from the origin to the negative direction. In the same way, a detector for the object B is placed on $(0, L, 0)$.

Let t_0 be the earliest time when the objects reach the each detectors. Recall here that all the beginning times are zero. Let v_0 be modulus of y-component of the velocity of each object at the outside of the measuring apparatus. For the object such that its finishing time is less than T, we denote the modulus of y-component of the velocity at the inside of the measuring apparatus by v(=const.).

Then our assumption can be expressed clearly as follows: For an object with its finishing time τ, let us assume that if $\tau \leq T$, then the time when the object escapes from the measuring apparatus is W/v; otherwise, the time when the object escapes from the measuring apparatus fluctuates uniformly in a time interval $[W/v, (W/v)+\tau]$ as a result of the interaction between the object and the measuring apparatus. Thus the closing time T characterizes the way of diffusion of the position of the object in the measuring process.

Let τ_A be a finishing time for a spin-1/2 object A. Then the probability of the object A existing in an interval $[y, y + \Delta y]$ of width $\Delta y \ll 1$ on the y-axis at the time t_0 becomes approximately

$$\rho_A(y)\Delta y = \theta(T - \tau_A)\chi_{[-L,-L+\Delta y]}(y) + \theta(\tau_A - T)\frac{1}{v_0\tau_A}\chi_{[-L,-L+v_0\tau_A]}(y)\Delta y.$$

Here for a subset E of the real line, χ_E represents the characteristic(defining) function of E that is defined as $\chi_E(\rho) = 1$, if $\rho \in E$; $\chi_E(\rho) = 0$, otherwise.

In the same way, let τ_B be a finishing time for a spin-1/2 object B. The probability of detection of the object B in an interval $[y, y + \Delta y]$ of width $\Delta y \ll 1$ at the time t_0 becomes approximately

$$\rho_B(y)\Delta y = \theta(T - \tau_B)\chi_{[L-\Delta y,L]}(y) + \theta(\tau_B - T)\frac{1}{v_0\tau_B}\chi_{[L-v_0\tau_B,L]}(y)\Delta y.$$

For the objects A and B whose finishing times are τ_A and τ_B, respectively, we estimate the probability p_c of coincidence detection. We partition the y-axis into

intervals $[y_n, y_{n+1})$, $n \in \mathbf{Z}$, of width Δy, where $y_n = n\Delta y$. Since the coincidence detection is done not only at the time t_0 but also at delayed times, it becomes, for $\Delta y \ll 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} p_c =& \sum_n \rho_A(-y_n)\Delta y \rho_B(y_n)\Delta y \\ \approx& \int dy \rho_A(-y)\rho_B(y)\Delta y \\ =& \theta(T-\tau_A)\theta(T-\tau_B) + O(\Delta y) \\ =& \theta(T-\tau_A \vee \tau_B) + O(\Delta y), \end{aligned}$$

where $\tau_A \vee \tau_B$ represents the maximum value between τ_A and τ_B. Thus if the accuracy Δy of position is very small, then the behavior of the p_c is like $\theta(T - \tau_A \vee \tau_B)$. This means that if at least one of the finishing times τ_A and τ_B is greater than T, then the probability of the objects A and B being detected at the same time vanish. Therefore the detected objects A and B at coincidence have finishing times τ_A and τ_B both of which are less than T with certainty.

Accordingly, as far as we use the coincidence counting, our local model violates the Bell inequality.

4. Discussion and Summary

We constructed a local model of spin-1/2 objects in the EPR-Bohm Gedanken-experiment. The fact that there exists a local model that violate the Bell inequality even for spin-1/2 objects supports the idea that the coincidence counting is the source of the non-locality and there exists no action at a distance in the EPR-Bohm situation.

Our model is an example that shows that interaction between the object and the measuring apparatus is not the unique reason why the probability space of outcomes of measurements changes according to what are measured. In fact, by introducing the closing time T, our model of §3 produces different probability spaces of outcomes according to the choice of different settings of the measuring

apparatus. Thus this local model becomes a contextual hidden-variable theory. In our model, the sample space changes according to the choice of $\theta_{\mathbf{ab}}$, the angle between the directions $\mathbf{a}$ and $\mathbf{b}$ of the spins of the objects A and B to be measured. Nevertheless, as shown in Fig. 6, the change of the number of samples is small (less than 10 %). Our results seem to be consistent with the results of the experiment[13] of Aspect *et al.*, though it was done for photons, in which there is no change in the number of samples.

In §2, we identified the ensemble of the states of the object distributed uniformly in each attractors with the corresponding eigenstates. In §3, we have identified the ensemble distributed in the subset s of Γ_{AB} with the EPR-Bohm quantum-mechanical state. One may ask what ensemble corresponds to a given quantum-mechanical state. The question is beyond the scope of this paper, because it is almost equivalent to understand the superposition principle of quantum states. In fact, in order to find the answer, we must understand the meaning of a phase of a quantum-mechanical state vector. For a stationary quantum-mechanical state vector, the phase evolves in time. This suggests that the phase has information of the dynamical evolution of the state of the object before the beginning of a measurement. Our phenomenological model lacks this information, since it treats only the dynamics after the beginning of a measurement.

However, it is interesting and important to find the answer, because this has deep connection with whether our human reason can understand things exist in the external world or not. It is known that propositions for quantum phenomena are subject to some non-Boolean logic[14]. These propositions are concerned with outcomes of measurements. While, since the human reason is subject to the Boolean logic, the outcomes of the measurements contradict the human reason. Accordingly, in order to understand the things behind the quantum phenomena by the human reason, we cannot help assuming something that is subject to the Boolean logic. Thus to understand the things in the external world means necessarily introduction of some hidden-variables into theory. Further, we must comprehend how the Boolean object characterized by the hidden-variables produces such non-

Boolean phenomena as quantum phenomena. Although our model in this paper is so restricted that it may have less connection with the things existing in the external world, it gives an example such that a Boolean object leads to non-Boolean phenomena. In this sense, our model is instructive. Our model suggests that the things existing in the external world would be local, too.

We summarize our results in the following: We have constructed a local hidden-variable model of spin-1/2 objects in the EPR-Bohm Gedankenexperiment. By instituting the appropriate closing time in sampling data, the correlation that is calculated by our model approximates the quantum-mechanical correlation. From this, as far as we use the coincidence counting, our local model violates the Bell inequality with no action at a distance.

Acknowledgements: I wish to express my gratitude to Professor T. Ishigaki and Professor K. Ishikawa for many helpful discussion and valuable suggestions and to Professor K. Fujii for interesting discussion.

REFERENCES

1. J. S. Bell, Rev. Mod. Phys. **38** (1966), 447-52; Kochen, S., E.P. Specker, Journ. Math. Mech. **17** (1967), 59-87
2. E. G. Beltrametti, G. Cassinel, *The Logic of Quantum Mechanics* (Addison-Wesley, 1981), ENCYCLOPEDIA OF MATHEMATICS and Its Applications, vol 15, Chap. 15
3. J. S. Bell, Physics **1** (1964), 195-200
4. S. J. Freedman, J. F. Clauser, Phys. Rev. Lett. **28** (1972), 938-41; E. S. Fry, R. C. Thompson, Phys. Rev. Lett. **37** (1976), 465-68; M. Lamehi-Rachti, W. Mittig, Phys. Rev. **D14** (1976), 2543-55; A. Aspect, P. Grangier, G. Roger, Phys. Rev. Lett. **47** (1981), 460-3, Phys. Rev. Lett. **49** (1982), 91-4, Phys. Rev. Lett. **49** (1982), 1804-7; W. Perrie, A. J. Duncan, H. J. Beyer, H. Kleinpoppen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **54** (1985), 1790-3

5. J. F. Clauser, M. A. Horne, Phys. Rev. **D10** (1974), 526-35

6. T. W. Marshall, E. Santos, F. Selleri, Phys. Lett. **98A** (1983), 5-9

7. G. C. Scalera, Lett. Nuovo Cimento **38** (1983), 16-8, Lett. Nuovo Cimento **40** (1984), 353-61

8. S. Notarrigo, Nuovo Cimento **83B** (1984), 173-87

9. S. Pascazio, Phys. Lett. **118A** (1986), 47-53

10. D. Bohm, *Quantum Theory* (Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York, 1951), Chap. 22.

11. Roughly speaking, an attractor is an invariant set on which neighboring trajectories accumulate. In our case, α_1 and α_2 are just limit cycles. See J. -P. Eckmann, D. Ruelle, Rev. Mod. Phys. **57**(1985), 617-56.

12. M. Redhead, *Incompleteness, Nonlocality, and Realism* (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1987), § 4.1. p. 85.

13. A. Aspect, P. Grangier, G. Roger, Phys. Rev. Lett. **49** (1982), 91-4

14. S. Watanabe, *KNOWING AND GUESSING - A Quantative Study of Inference and Information* (Wiley, 1969)

FIGURE CAPTIONS

1) The probability of S_z being $+j$ for the ensemble of states distributed uniformly in β_θ plotted versus the relative angle θ. $\diamond$ represents the results of our model and the solid curve is the corresponding results of quantum mechanics.

2) The correlation of $\mathbf{S}_A \cdot \mathbf{e}_z$ and $\mathbf{S}_B \cdot T_\theta \mathbf{e}_z$ for the ensemble of states distributed uniformly in s plotted versus the relative angle θ. $\diamond$ represents the results of our model and the solid curve is the corresponding results of quantum mechanics. The value of the closing time in sampling T is 0.133.

3) The correlation of $\mathbf{S}_A \cdot \mathbf{e}_z$ and $\mathbf{S}_B \cdot T_\theta \mathbf{e}_z$ without the closing time for the ensemble of states distributed uniformly in s plotted versus the relative angle θ. $\diamond$ represents the results of our model and the solid curve is the corresponding results of quantum mechanics.

4) Graph of $F(\phi)$ given in ref. (12) against the relative angle ϕ. $\diamond$ represents the results of our model with the closing time T=0.133. $\times$ represents the results of our model without the closing time. The solid curve is the corresponding results of quantum mechanics.

5) A schematic diagram of the arrangement of the devices. Each clock shows the time when the object whose finishing time is less than T exists at each indicated place.

6) Graph of the number of samples in the calculation of the correlations for the ensemble of states distributed uniformly in s against the relative angle. The value of the closing time T is 0.133.

This figure "fig1-1.png" is available in "png" format from:

http://arXiv.org/ps/quant-ph/9502002v1

This figure "fig1-2.png" is available in "png" format from:

http://arXiv.org/ps/quant-ph/9502002v1

This figure "fig1-3.png" is available in "png" format from:

http://arXiv.org/ps/quant-ph/9502002v1